THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition (M/S) No. 1501 of 2006.

1. Uday Singh S/O Ramsawroop R/O Village Bongla, Post Bhadrabad, District Haridwar.
2. Mamraj Singh S/O Late Baliyan Singh, R/O Village Rohalki-Kishanpur, Post Bhadrabad, District Haridwar.
3. Virendra Kumar S/O Shri Salekh Chand, R/O Village Katarpur, District Haridwar.

… **Petitioners.**

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal through Secretary Education, Dehradun.
2. Secretary Secondary Education, Dehradun.
3. District Education Officer, Haridwar.
4. Zila Basic Shiksha Adhikari District Haridwar.

… **Respondents.**

Sri Sanjeev Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Sri Nand Prasad, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

Date September 28, 2006
P.C.: (Hon'ble B.S. Verma, J.)

(Interim Relief Application No. 12433 of 2006)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the record.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioners have prayed for issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding/directing the respondents to entertain the candidature/applications of the petitioners for Special BTC Training as per advertisement dated 9-7-2006 and also to give age relaxation to the petitioners for the said course.

Admittedly, the Government Order dated 19-3-2005 was issued extending benefit of age relaxation to the candidates, who had applied for the Special BTC Training in the year 2001. By the Government Order dated 1-8-2006 clarification has been issued by the Government of Uttaranchal regarding the queries made by the Director of Education vide letter No. 22501/2006-2007 dated 29-7-2006. By this G.O. provision of relaxation in age was

clarified for the applicants who had applied for Special B.T.C. Training in the year 2001 and who attained age above 40 years on 1.7.2004.

Admittedly, the petitioners herein had not applied for the Special B.T.C. Training course following the advertisement dated 9-7-2006, therefore, no benefit of the said G.O. dated 19-3-2005 could be extended to them though they are said to have applied earlier in the years 2001 and 2005.

In any view of the matter, the prayer of the petitioners is not entertainable and the writ petition filed by the petitioners is devoid of merit and no interim relief can be granted to the petitioners. Accordingly the writ petition is dismissed in-limine.

(B.S. Verma, J.)

RCP